UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,088	01/18/2006	Tino Hansel	INA-PT169(4248-18-US)	5596
3624 VOLPE AND K	7590 10/27/201 KOENIG, P.C .		EXAMINER	
UNITED PLAZA	ZA .		RASHID, MAHBUBUR	
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3657	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/27/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eoffice@volpe-koenig.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. 10/565,088		Applicant(s)
		HANSEL, TINO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MAHBUBUR RASHID	3657

	MALIBODOLLLIAGILID	3037				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 October 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITI	ON FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on tapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appefor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Ciperiods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, al (with appeal fee) in com	affidavit, or other evidence, which places th pliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Reques	ie			
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	visory Action, or (2) the date ter than SIX MONTHS from th	e mailing date of the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exteunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the street forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n which the petition under 37 nsion and the corresponding ortened statutory period for r	amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee eply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a	as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was presented. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since	f ∋			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b They raise new issues that would require further con They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (: /);	see NOTE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette	er form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alk non-allowable claim(s). 		-	е			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-9 and 11-17.) will be entered and an explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
 FFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections unde	er appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for allowance because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (§13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Bradley T King/ Primary Examine	r, Art Unit 3657				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the 112 rejection, the applicant has pointed out the evidence and thus the examiner has withdrawn the 112 rejection.

Regarding the argument on page 4 of the remarks, the applicant argues that Kadota et al. fail to disclose initiating a program that enables operation of the internal combustion engine at a lower power level. The examiner notes that as the applicant agreed that the reference of Kadota et al. specifically teaches that, upon receiving the high level signal S the engine output limiting portion 51 b limits an increase in output of an engine to prevent the occurrence of the gear skip in the timing belt 41. In other words, a program has to enable operation of the engine of Kadota at a lower power level. It is thus, Kadota either alone or combined with Inada, Inagaki et al. and Wilmore discloses all claimed limitation. Therefore, the rejection is proper and valid.

Regarding the fault memory, the applicant argues that Amisano does not disclose a controller with a fault memory that is adapted to detect both limit value-exceeding measurement values and measurement values that correspond to a tolerance array set as claimed. The examiner notes that the claim only requires a controller with a fault memory. In other words, the applicant uses the phrase "adapted to" which indicates that the limitations followed by such pharse are not prositively claimed. The examiner further notes that Amisano clearly discloses a controller that supplies a fault signal (see abstract). Therefore, the combination of the prior art discloses all of the limitations as claimed and thus the rejection is proper and valid.